U. S. Bancorp v. Commissioner, 115 T. C. 13 (2000)

Costs incurred to terminate a lease and simultaneously enter into a new lease must be capitalized and amortized over the term of the new lease when the transactions are integrated.

Summary

In U. S. Bancorp v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether a $2. 5 million charge paid to terminate a lease on a mainframe computer and immediately enter into a new lease for a more powerful computer should be immediately deductible or capitalized. The court held that the charge must be capitalized and amortized over the 5-year term of the new lease because the termination and new lease were integrated transactions. This decision hinged on the fact that the termination was contingent on entering the new lease, indicating the charge was a cost of acquiring the new lease's future benefits, not merely terminating the old one.

Facts

West One Bancorp, later merged into U. S. Bancorp, leased an IBM 3090 mainframe computer from IBM Credit Corp. (ICC) in 1989. In 1990, West One determined the 3090 was inadequate and sought to upgrade. They entered into a 'Rollover Agreement' with ICC, terminating the first lease and immediately leasing a more powerful IBM 580 computer. The termination required a $2. 5 million 'rollover charge,' which was financed over the 5-year term of the new lease. U. S. Bancorp claimed this charge as a deductible expense in 1990, but the IRS disallowed the deduction, asserting it should be capitalized and amortized over the new lease term.

Procedural History

The case originated when U. S. Bancorp filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court after the IRS issued a statutory notice of deficiency disallowing the $2. 5 million deduction. Both parties moved for partial summary judgment on the issue of whether the charge should be deducted or capitalized. The Tax Court granted the IRS's motion for partial summary judgment, ruling that the charge must be capitalized.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $2. 5 million rollover charge incurred to terminate the first lease and enter into the second lease is an ordinary and necessary business expense deductible under section 162 in the year incurred?

2. Whether the $2. 5 million rollover charge must be capitalized under section 263 and amortized over the term of the second lease?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the rollover charge was not merely a cost to terminate the first lease but was also a cost to acquire the second lease, resulting in future benefits.
2. Yes, because the termination and initiation of the new lease were integrated events, and the charge was a cost of obtaining future benefits under the second lease.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the principles from INDOPCO, Inc. v. Commissioner, noting that expenditures must be capitalized if they result in significant future benefits. The court found that the termination of the first lease and the initiation of the second were integrated, as the termination was expressly conditioned on entering the new lease. This integration meant the rollover charge was not just a cost of terminating the first lease but also a cost of acquiring the second lease, which provided future benefits. The court distinguished cases cited by the petitioner, such as Rev. Rul. 69-511, where termination fees were deductible because no subsequent lease followed. The court also relied on Pig & Whistle Co. v. Commissioner and Phil Gluckstern’s, Inc. v. Commissioner, where unamortized costs of terminated leases were treated as part of the cost of subsequent leases. The court concluded that the full amount of the rollover charge must be capitalized and amortized over the term of the new lease, rejecting any allocation of the charge between termination and acquisition.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how businesses account for costs associated with terminating and immediately entering new leases. Companies must carefully consider whether such costs should be capitalized and amortized over the term of the new lease, especially when the transactions are integrated. This ruling may influence tax planning strategies, particularly for businesses frequently upgrading equipment through lease arrangements. It also underscores the need for clear documentation of the terms and conditions of lease agreements and any related termination or rollover charges. Subsequent cases have applied this principle, reinforcing that the nature of the transaction (integrated vs. isolated) is critical in determining the tax treatment of such costs.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.